

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

FED. NAT'L MORTG. ASS'N,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNEST C. ALDRIDGE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-02366-MMD-EJY

ORDER

AND ALL RELATED CASES

I. SUMMARY

The Court has a very simple message for *pro se* Defendants Ernest C. Aldridge and Clarence Moses Willis: if you do not carefully follow the instructions in this order, the Court will issue a warrant for your arrest. Plaintiff Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae") filed this case to quiet title to nine properties it owns. (ECF No. 1.) Fannie Mae won (ECF No. 264), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed (ECF No. 278), but nonetheless Defendants—particularly Aldridge and Willis—have persisted in a fraudulent, vexatious, contemptuous, and frivolous course of conduct, disobeying court orders, filing new frivolous cases, failing to appear for hearings, and continuing to try to sell properties that United States District Judge James C. Mahan has already declared Fannie Mae owns. The Court consolidated several related cases (now called member cases) into this earliest filed case. (ECF No. 312.) This order addresses several pending motions in this case, along with several pending motions in the member cases. More than anything, however, this order is Aldridge and Willis' last chance to permit these related cases to be brought to a resolution before the Court issues a warrant for their arrest.

///

///

II. BACKGROUND

To start, the Court incorporates by reference the Final Judgment Judge Mahan issued, which lists the properties Fannie Mae owns, invalidates and expunges various fraudulent recorded instruments prepared by Aldridge and Willis, invalidates any purported property rights stemming from those instruments, invalidates various fraudulent business licenses and permits held by Willis, and states that Fannie Mae is entitled to \$103,300 in punitive damages from Willis. (ECF No. 264 (“Judgment”).) The Court will refer to the properties listed in the Judgment in this order as the Judgment Properties.

The Ninth Circuit fully affirmed the Judgment. (ECF No. 278.) There is no record on the docket that a writ of certiorari was ever filed, much less granted. The Judgment is accordingly final. Among other findings, the Ninth Circuit noted that this Court properly has diversity jurisdiction over this case (*id.* at 2), noted that Fannie Mae is deemed a District of Columbia corporation by federal statute for jurisdictional purposes (*id.* at 4) and rejected as meritless Aldridge’s argument that Judge Mahan “erred by entering final judgment while his motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction was still pending[.]” (*id.*) The Ninth Circuit also noted, “[t]o the extent that Willis challenges the district court’s orders denying his motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, the district court properly denied his motions to dismiss because the requirements for diversity jurisdiction were met.” (*id.* at 5.)

In March 2021, Fannie Mae filed an emergency motion for an order to show cause in this case as to why Aldridge and Willis should not be held in contempt of court for violating the Judgment. (ECF No. 285.) Judge Mahan granted that motion, finding that Aldridge and Willis were holding themselves out as the owners of one of the Judgment Properties, in Fernley, and trying to sell it to unsuspecting buyers. (ECF No. 287 at 1-4.) Judge Mahan accordingly ordered Aldridge and Willis to show cause why he should not hold them in contempt. (*id.* at 4-5.) Judge Mahan set a show cause hearing. (*id.* at 5.)

Aldridge and Willis did not appear at the show cause hearing. (ECF No. 294.) Judge Mahan thus adjudged them in contempt of court and directed Fannie Mae’s

1 counsel to prepare a proposed order for his review explaining his contempt finding that
2 he made at the show cause hearing. (*Id.*)

3 While Fannie Mae filed the proposed order Judge Mahan ordered it to (ECF No.
4 296), Judge Mahan did not sign the proposed order before deciding to recuse from the
5 case because the Judgment Property Willis and Aldridge was trying to sell—and was
6 accordingly the focus of the contempt proceedings—is located in Fernley (ECF No. 300).
7 Judge Mahan accordingly ordered this case reassigned to a Reno judge. (*Id.*) The case
8 was subsequently assigned to the Court. (ECF No. 309.)

9 Meanwhile, Fannie Mae had filed one of the now pending motions in this case:
10 another motion for an order to show cause why the Court should not hold Aldridge and
11 Willis in contempt for violating the Judgment. (ECF No. 304 (“Contempt Motion”).) Fannie
12 Mae argues in the Contempt Motion that Willis and Aldridge continue to challenge Fannie
13 Mae’s ownership of three of the Judgment Properties (two in Las Vegas in addition to the
14 one in Fernley) in violation of the Judgment. (*Id.* at 1-2.) And Fannie Mae further argues
15 that Willis and Aldridge have recorded additional fraudulent instruments on the property
16 in Fernley even since Judge Mahan found them in contempt of court. (*Id.* at 2.) Willis and
17 Aldridge filed responses to the Contempt Motion (ECF Nos. 305, 306), and Fannie Mae
18 filed a reply (ECF No. 307).

19 More recently, Willis filed a motion that he titled a motion to remand to state court
20 and/or a statement that he does not consent to federal jurisdiction. (ECF No. 315.) That
21 motion is also currently pending.¹ In that motion, Willis appears to argue that he was not
22 properly served with a notice of removal of a state court case regarding the property in
23 Fernley, does not consent to the jurisdiction of this Court, and would apparently like any
24 dispute about the Fernley property remanded to state court. (*Id.*) Willis then proceeded to
25 file two notices of related cases indicating that there are pending state court cases
26 regarding two of the Judgment Properties (the Fernley property and one of the Las Vegas
27 properties). (ECF Nos. 316, 317.)

28 _____
¹Fannie Mae filed a response. (ECF No. 319.)

1 In sum, there are two pending motions in this case. The Court addresses them in
2 the Discussion section below. In addition, and as noted at the outset, the Court
3 consolidated three member cases into this case after this case was reassigned to it. (ECF
4 No. 312.) Those cases are *Aldridge v. Fed. Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n, et al.*, Case No. 2:21-cv-
5 01816-MMD-EJY (D. Nev. Filed Sept. 30, 2021) (the "*Homeria Case*"), *Aldridge v. Fed.*
6 *Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n, et al.*, Case No. 2:21-cv-01913-MMD-EJY (D. Nev. Filed Oct. 18, 2021)
7 (the "*Canadian Case*"), and *Aldridge v. Fed. Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n, et al.*, Case 3:21-cv-
8 00485-MMD-CLB (D. Nev. Filed Nov. 17, 2021) (the "*Garden Case*"). (ECF No. 312.) The
9 Court's consolidation order closed the member cases but did not address the pending
10 motions in each case. (*Id.*)

11 There are four pending motions in the *Homeria Case*, four pending motions in the
12 *Canadian Case*, and one pending motion in the *Garden Case*. This order will also resolve
13 the pending motions in these member cases.

14 The Court now briefly describes the member cases and the pending motions
15 therein. The *Homeria Case* is about one of the Judgment Properties: 5373 Homeria St.,
16 Las Vegas, NV. (ECF No. 264 at 2.) *See also Homeria Case*, ECF No. 1-1 at 2. In the
17 *Homeria Case*, Aldridge seeks to quiet title to 5373 Homeria St., Las Vegas, NV in his
18 favor based on a quitclaim deed with the instrument number 20151012-0003374. *See id.*
19 Judge Mahan declared that same quitclaim deed invalid in the Judgment.² (ECF No. 264
20 at 3.)

21 The *Canadian Case* is also about one of the Judgment Properties: 4912 Canadian
22 Drive, Las Vegas, NV. (*Id.* at 2.) *See also Canadian Case*, ECF No. 1-1 at 2; *see also*
23 ECF No. 9 (amended complaint that only adds parties). In the *Canadian Case*, Aldridge
24 seeks to quiet title to 4912 Canadian Drive, Las Vegas, NV in his favor based on a
25 quitclaim deed with the instrument number 20150721-0002200. *See* ECF No. 1-1 at 3.

26
27
28 ²Aldridge also previously filed a different quiet title action about this property in
state court, but Fannie Mae won a judgment of dismissal, successfully arguing that case
was issue precluded by the Judgment. (ECF No. 304 at 4.)

1 Judge Mahan declared that same quitclaim deed invalid in the Judgment.³ (ECF No. 264
2 at 3.)

3 The *Garden Case*, too, is about one of the Judgment Properties: 330 Garden Lane,
4 Fernley, NV. (*Id.* at 2-3.) See also *Garden Case*, ECF No. 1-1 at 2-3. In the *Garden Case*,
5 Aldridge seeks to quiet title to 330 Garden Lane, Fernley, NV in his favor based on a
6 Grant Deed with Document Number 645910. See *id.* at 4. Judge Mahan does not mention
7 a Grant Deed with that number in the Judgment but did invalidate two other purported
8 instruments recorded against 330 Garden Lane, Fernley, NV. (ECF No. 264 at 4.) 330
9 Garden Lane, Fernley, NV is also the Fernley property that has become the focus of the
10 contempt proceedings in this case, as described above. Fannie Mae argues in the
11 Contempt Motion—supported by exhibits⁴—that Aldridge’s recording of the Grant Deed
12 with Document Number 645910 is further evidence of his contempt of court and violates
13 the Judgment. (ECF No. 304 at 7-8.)

14 In each of the three member cases, Fannie Mae has filed at least one motion to
15 dismiss arguing that the member cases are precluded by the Judgment—and those
16 motions are pending. See *Homeria Case*, ECF No. 10; *Canadian Case*, ECF Nos. 5, 13;
17 *Garden Case*, ECF No. 5. In the *Homeria Case*, Fannie Mae also filed a pending motion
18 for sanctions. See *Homeria Case*, ECF No. 13. And Aldridge filed two pending motions
19 to remand. See *id.*, ECF Nos. 9, 16. In the *Canadian Case*, Fannie Mae also filed a
20 pending motion for sanctions. See *Canadian Case*, ECF No. 12. And Aldridge filed two

21
22
23 ³³Aldridge also previously filed another quiet title action about this property in state
24 court, but Fannie Mae won a judgment of dismissal, successfully arguing that case was
claim precluded by the Judgment. (ECF No. 304 at 4.)

25 ⁴Fannie Mae requests the Court take judicial notice of the court records and
26 publicly recorded documents it has submitted as exhibits. (ECF No. 304 at 8.) The Court
27 grants the request, and takes judicial notice of ECF Nos. 304-1, 304-2, 304-3, 304-4, 304-
28 5, 304-6, 304-7, 304-8, 304-9, and 304-10. See *Harris v. County of Orange*, 682 F.3d
1126, 1131-32 (9th Cir. 2012) (taking judicial notice of documents on file in federal court
and noting that a court may take judicial notice of documents on file in state or federal
court); see also *Dowers v. Nationstar Mortg., LLC*, 852 F.3d 964, 967 n.1 (9th Cir. 2017)
(taking judicial notice of “publicly-recorded documents”).

1 pending motions to remand. See *id.*, ECF Nos. 10, 17. No other motions beyond Fannie
 2 Mae's motion to dismiss are pending in the *Garden Case*.

3 **III. DISCUSSION**

4 The Court briefly explains its resolution of the pending motions in each of the
 5 member cases, and then explains its resolution of the pending motions in this case, along
 6 with the next steps in this case.

7 **A. Member Cases**

8 Because the Court finds that the analysis is essentially the same as to each of the
 9 three, the Court addresses all three of the member cases together. The Court finds all
 10 three of the cases alternatively barred by claim or issue preclusion. The Court will
 11 accordingly grant Fannie Mae's pending motions to dismiss and deny the other pending
 12 motions as moot. The Court further denies the sanctions motions Fannie Mae filed in the
 13 member cases because the Court will address Willis and Aldridge's sanctionable conduct
 14 in the context of the contempt proceedings in this case.

15 **1. Claim Preclusion**

16 Claim preclusion bars a later-filed lawsuit when "the earlier suit ... (1) involved the
 17 same 'claim' or cause of action as the later suit, (2) reached a final judgment on the merits,
 18 and (3) involved identical parties or privies." *Mpoyo v. Litton Electro-Optical Sys.*, 430
 19 F.3d 985, 987 (9th Cir. 2005) (citation omitted). To determine whether the two cases
 20 involve the same claim or cause of action, the Court must consider: "(1) whether the two
 21 suits arise out of the same transactional nucleus of facts; (2) whether rights or interests
 22 established in the prior judgment would be destroyed or impaired by prosecution of the
 23 second action; (3) whether the two suits involve infringement of the same right; and (4)
 24 whether substantially the same evidence is presented in the two actions." *Id.* (citation
 25 omitted).

26 The doctrine of claim preclusion bars the member cases. As to whether they
 27 involve the same claim, and as described *supra* in Section II, Aldridge is trying to quiet
 28 title to three of the Judgment Properties in his favor in the member cases. The member

1 cases accordingly arise out of the same transactional nucleus of facts. Moreover, were
2 Aldridge to somehow prevail in the member cases, Fannie Mae's rights in the Judgment
3 Properties as obtained in the Judgment would be destroyed or impaired. While the term
4 'infringement' may not be a perfect fit for these cases, both this case and the member
5 cases are quiet title actions attempting to establish that only one party owns three of the
6 Judgment Properties. Finally, substantially the same evidence is presented in the
7 member cases as compared to this case. As also described *supra* in Section II, in two of
8 the three member cases (*Homeria Case* and *Canadian Case*), Aldridge is attempting to
9 use the very recorded instruments deemed fraudulent and invalid in the Judgment as the
10 basis for his ownership claim. And in the *Garden Case*, Aldridge relies on a recorded
11 instrument that Judge Mahan already found contemptuous of court to establish his title to
12 the Garden property in Fernley. See *id.* In sum, the member cases involve the same
13 claims already resolved by the Judgment in this case.

14 Turning to the second factor, the Judgment is a final judgment on the merits. See
15 *id.*

16 As to the third factor, each of the cases at least involve privies. To start, Aldridge
17 and Fannie Mae are parties to both cases. Further, again comparing this case to each of
18 the member cases, both seek or sought to quiet title in only one party's favor. Accordingly,
19 the other parties to each of the cases are privies because they are people or entities who
20 might have some interest in the Judgment Properties, but do not because of the
21 Judgment—which has already definitively established that Fannie Mae owns each of the
22 Judgment Properties.

23 All three claim preclusion factors therefore compel the finding that the member
24 cases are barred by the doctrine of claim preclusion.

25 2. Issue Preclusion

26 The doctrine of issue preclusion bars litigation of a "question, issue, or fact when
27 four conditions are met: (1) the issue at stake was identical in both proceedings; (2) the
28 issue was actually litigated and decided in the prior proceedings; (3) there was a full and

1 fair opportunity to litigate the issue; and (4) the issue was necessary to decide the merits.”
2 *Oyeniran v. Holder*, 672 F.3d 800, 806 (9th Cir. 2012), *as amended* (May 3, 2012).

3 The doctrine of issue preclusion also bars litigation of the central issue in each of
4 the member cases: ownership of the Judgment Properties. Again as described *supra* in
5 Section II, each of the three member cases seeks to quiet title in three of the Judgment
6 Properties—the same issue already resolved in the Judgment in this case, where Judge
7 Mahan declared that Fannie Mae (not anyone else, including Aldridge) owns the
8 Judgment Properties. The issue of who owns the Judgment Properties was actually
9 litigated and decided in the Judgment—and Aldridge and Willis unsuccessfully appealed
10 it to the Ninth Circuit. That also speaks to the third factor. Aldridge and Willis had a full
11 and fair opportunity to litigate who owned the Judgment Properties. Finally, the issue of
12 ownership of the Judgment Properties was necessarily decided in the Judgment because
13 Fannie Mae sought (and of course successfully obtained) a declaration that it was the
14 sole owner of the Judgment Properties.

15 Because all four factors weigh in favor of also finding the member cases barred by
16 the doctrine of issue preclusion, the Court alternatively finds that all three member cases
17 are barred under that doctrine. And as the Court has found that all three member cases
18 are barred on two independent grounds, the Court accordingly grants Fannie Mae’s
19 motions to dismiss in each of the member cases and denies the other pending motions
20 in the member cases as moot.

21 **B. This Case**

22 To start, the Court reiterates that Judge Mahan already found Willis and Aldridge
23 in civil contempt of court. (ECF No. 294.) Thus, the question before the Court is not
24 whether Willis and Aldridge are in contempt of court, but what to do about it. The Court
25 accordingly instructs Willis and Aldridge to read on, paying particular attention to the
26 Conclusion section of this order. Willis and Aldridge: this is your last chance to change
27 course and bring all matters regarding the Judgment Properties to resolution in Fannie
28 Mae’s favor before the Court orders your arrest to compel your compliance and considers

1 making you liable for substantial, additional sums of money corresponding to fees and
2 costs Fannie Mae has expended on this litigation since the Judgment issued.

3 Next, Willis' pending motion to remand (ECF No. 315) is denied as frivolous. The
4 Ninth Circuit explicitly considered and rejected essentially the same arguments Willis
5 raises in that motion. (ECF No. 278 at 5.)

6 The Court accordingly turns to Fannie Mae's pending motion for an order to show
7 cause (ECF No. 304), in which Fannie Mae also points out that Judge Mahan did not sign
8 its proposed contempt order before this case was reassigned (*id.* at 7, 7 n.35). In the
9 motion, Fannie Mae argues that Aldridge and Willis remain in contempt of court because
10 they continue to ignore the Judgment, and to the contrary, hold themselves out as owners
11 of the Judgment Properties, continue to record fraudulent instruments against the
12 Judgment Properties, and file frivolous lawsuits about them. (*Id.* at 9.) Fannie Mae
13 accordingly requests the Court issue a contempt order containing certain provisions. (*Id.*
14 at 9-11.)

15 Though Aldridge and Willis did not appear at the last contempt show cause hearing
16 Judge Mahan held (ECF No. 294), they both filed responses to Fannie Mae's motion (ECF
17 Nos. 305, 306). This indicates to the Court that Aldridge and Willis are aware of the
18 proceedings in this case but are willfully ignoring the Judgment and disobeying the Court's
19 orders.

20 In Willis' response, he appears to argue that he did not receive proper notice of
21 Fannie Mae's prior motion for an order to show cause, which excused his appearance
22 from the show cause hearing. (ECF No. 305 at 4.) Not so. Willis is in contempt of court
23 because he did not appear at that hearing. But in any event, the Court will direct that a
24 copy of this order be mailed to Willis by certified mail so he is aware of the upcoming
25 show cause hearing the Court will hold to coerce him to begin complying with the Court's
26 orders and respecting the Judgment.

27 Willis otherwise states that he understands this Court no longer has jurisdiction
28 over this case because a state court case was filed about the 330 Garden Lane property

1 in Fernley. (*Id.* at 4-5.) Willis' understanding is incorrect. As Judge Mahan and the Ninth
2 Circuit have already explained to Willis, this Court has jurisdiction over this case. The
3 filing of a state court case about one of the Judgment Properties does not divest this Court
4 of jurisdiction. Moreover, Willis has been told his understanding about this Court's
5 jurisdiction is incorrect enough times in this case that continuing to raise the argument
6 also shows Willis' contempt of court.

7 In Aldridge's response, he first argues he is not subject to the Judgment because
8 he is not mentioned in it. (ECF No. 306 at 1-2.) Aldridge is simply incorrect: he is
9 mentioned in the Judgment. (ECF No. 264 at 1.) The Judgment applies to him. Moreover,
10 as explained above, Aldridge continues to argue he owns the Judgment Properties
11 including by filing the member cases. By filing the member cases, Aldridge ignored the
12 Judgment and demonstrates his contempt of court.

13 Aldridge otherwise contests this Court's jurisdiction over this case (ECF No. 306
14 at 2), but like Willis, Aldridge's jurisdictional argument has already been rejected several
15 times, including by the Ninth Circuit. (ECF No. 278.) Aldridge must begin respecting the
16 Judgment and complying with the Court's orders.

17 To further reiterate to Willis and Aldridge, the question of who owns the Judgment
18 Properties was already definitively resolved in the Judgment. (ECF No. 264.) Fannie Mae
19 owns the Judgment Properties. (*Id.*) Any actions to somehow establish that a person or
20 entity other than Fannie Mae owns the Judgment Properties violate the Judgment and
21 evidence contempt of court. Filing more lawsuits about the Judgment Properties, in any
22 court, will not change the fact of Fannie Mae's ownership, but will only provide further
23 evidence of contempt of court. In addition to Aldridge filing the frivolous member cases
24 and similar cases in state court continuing to contest ownership of the Judgment
25 Properties (as described throughout this order), Aldridge and Willis signed documents
26 purporting to convey interests in the 330 Garden Lane property in Fernley between
27 themselves and entities they control after the Judgment issued. (ECF Nos. 285-5, 304-9,
28 304-10.) These documents cannot be reconciled with the Judgment and are accordingly

1 null and void. And as noted, the fact that Aldridge and Willis recorded these documents
2 further demonstrates their contempt of court. Fannie Mae's motion (ECF No. 304) is
3 accordingly granted.

4 The Court now draws upon its civil contempt power to attempt to compel Aldridge
5 and Willis to begin respecting the Judgment, and accordingly drop all of their claims to
6 the Judgment Properties and ensure Fannie Mae can sell the Judgment Properties
7 without further interference from Aldridge and Willis. *See Shell Offshore Inc. v.*
8 *Greenpeace, Inc.*, 815 F.3d 623, 628-30 (9th Cir. 2016) (explaining that federal courts'
9 civil contempt power allows them to fashion remedies to coerce compliance with their
10 orders); *Uphaus v. Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72, 81 (1959) (stating that a federal court may
11 imprison someone to compel compliance with court orders provided that the person is
12 released if and when they comply with the court order or orders). To do this, the Court
13 sets a show cause hearing, and orders Aldridge and Willis to perform certain actions
14 between now and the hearing. If Aldridge and Willis complete these actions before the
15 hearing, Fannie Mae may ask the Court to vacate the show cause hearing. If they do not,
16 the Court will issue a warrant for Aldridge and Willis's arrest. Upon arrest, the Court will
17 then imprison them only until they complete the actions specified in the Conclusion
18 section below. If Aldridge and Willis do not appear at the show cause hearing, the Court
19 will also order their arrest. The Court further reserves the right to subject Willis and
20 Aldridge to escalating monetary sanctions as described below if even the threat of
21 imprisonment and/or imprisonment is insufficient to convince them to begin respecting
22 the Judgment.

23 **IV. CONCLUSION**

24 The Court notes that the parties made several arguments and cited to several
25 cases not discussed above. The Court has reviewed these arguments and cases and
26 determines that they do not warrant discussion as they do not affect the outcome of the
27 motions before the Court.

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that the *Homeria Case*, Case No. 2:21-cv-01816-MMD-EJY,
2 is alternatively barred by the doctrines of claim and issue preclusion. Fannie Mae's
3 pending motion to dismiss that case (ECF No. 10) is granted. The other pending motions
4 (ECF Nos. 9, 13, 16) are denied. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in
5 Fannie Mae's favor in the *Homeria Case* in accordance with this order and keep it closed.

6 It is further ordered that the *Canadian Case*, Case No. 2:21-cv-01913-MMD-EJY,
7 is alternatively barred by the doctrines of claim and issue preclusion. Fannie Mae's
8 pending motion to dismiss the amended complaint in that case (ECF No. 13) is granted.
9 The other pending motions (ECF Nos. 5, 10, 12, 17) are denied. The Clerk of Court is
10 directed to enter judgment in Fannie Mae's favor in the *Canadian Case* in accordance
11 with this order and keep it closed.

12 It is further ordered that the *Garden Case*, Case No. 3:21-cv-00485-MMD-EJY, is
13 alternatively barred by the doctrines of claim and issue preclusion. Fannie Mae's pending
14 motion to dismiss that case (ECF No. 5) is granted. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter
15 judgment in Fannie Mae's favor in the *Garden Case* in accordance with this order and
16 keep it closed.

17 **It is further ordered that Willis and Aldridge are, and remain, in contempt of**
18 **Court.**

19 It is further ordered that Fannie Mae's motion for an order to show cause in this
20 case (ECF No. 304) is granted as specified herein.

21 It is further ordered that Willis' motion to remand in this case (ECF No. 315) is
22 denied.

23 It is further ordered that the following recorded documents regarding 330 Garden
24 Lane, Fernley, Nevada are void *ab initio* and are hereby expunged: QuitClaim Deed,
25 recorded on December 21, 2020, as Document No. 627159; Grant Deed, recorded on
26 March 18, 2021, as Document No. 633158; and Grant Deed, recorded on October 12,
27 2021, as Document No. 645190.

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that Willis and Aldridge must show cause why the Court should
2 not issue a warrant for their arrest as an escalating sanction for their continued contempt
3 of Court at an in person hearing on Thursday, May 19, 2022, at 11:00 a.m. in Courtroom
4 5 of the Bruce. R. Thompson Federal Courthouse located at 400 S. Virginia St. Reno, NV
5 89501. (ECF No. 318.)

6 It is further ordered that, if Willis or Aldridge do not appear at the show cause
7 hearing mentioned above, the Court will immediately issue a warrant for their arrest.

8 It is further ordered that Willis and Aldridge must do the following between the date
9 of entry of this order and the show cause hearing:

- 10 1. Deliver possession of the real property located 330 Garden Lane, Fernley,
11 Nevada, 89408 to Fannie Mae, ensuring that it is free of all persons and personal
12 property, that any and all signage indicating that the property is for sale or lease
13 are removed, and that any and all advertisements indicating the property is for sale
14 or lease are removed.
- 15 2. Do the same for all of the other Judgment Properties.
- 16 3. Take the necessary steps to have any and all interests recorded by Aldridge and
17 Willis on the Judgment Properties not already expunged by the Judgment or this
18 order expunged from property records.
- 19 4. Obtain voluntary dismissals of any and all lawsuits filed by Aldridge or Willis and
20 still pending regarding the Judgment Properties.
- 21 5. Sign and deliver to Fannie Mae's counsel a written document prepared by Fannie
22 Mae's counsel stating that Aldridge and Willis have, and will in perpetuity,
23 relinquish any and all existing interests in the Judgment Properties, and cease and
24 desist from contesting Fannie Mae's ownership of the Judgment Properties.

25 It is further ordered that if Willis and Aldridge complete all of the tasks enumerated
26 above between now and the show cause hearing, Fannie Mae must file a written notice
27 with the Court asking that the show cause hearing be vacated.

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that, if Willis and Aldridge do not complete all of the tasks
2 enumerated above between now and the show cause hearing, the Court may have them
3 arrested at the conclusion of the show cause hearing. Upon arrest, the Court will then
4 imprison them only until they complete the tasks enumerated above.

5 It is further ordered that, if Willis and Aldridge do not complete all of the tasks
6 enumerated above between now and the show cause hearing or fail to appear for the
7 show cause hearing, the Court may subsequently permit Fannie Mae to enter onto any
8 of the Judgment Properties, secure them, and remove any persons, personal property,
9 and for-sale/for-lease signage in accordance with this order.

10 It is further ordered that, if Willis and Aldridge do not complete all of the tasks
11 enumerated above between now and the show cause hearing or fail to appear for the
12 show cause hearing, the Court may order that Willis and Aldridge are jointly and severally
13 liable for all of Fannie Mae's attorneys' fees and costs incurred in litigating any and all
14 issues related to the Judgment Properties that post-date the Judgment and are not part
15 of the direct appeal of the Judgment.

16 It is further ordered that, if Willis and Aldridge do not complete all of the tasks
17 enumerated above between now and the show cause hearing or fail to appear for the
18 show cause hearing, the Court may order that Willis and Aldridge are jointly and severally
19 liable for all of Fannie Mae's costs it incurs to take possession of the Judgment Properties
20 or remove any persons or personal property from them, if necessary and upon Fannie
21 Mae's request.

22 The Clerk of Court is directed to mail copies of this order to *pro se* Defendants
23 Aldridge and Willis by certified mail with return receipt requested.

24 DATED THIS 15th Day of March 2022.



25
26
27 MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28